REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action of September 23, 2004, applicant, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, proposes entry of this amendment, amending claims 1, 3, 6, 20, and 21 to more clearly recite the features of the present invention, while canceling claim 9.

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 102(a) rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 12, 20, and 22 over Shigeki (JP '703). In the memory means disclosed by Shigeki, data related to a viewer's interest is stored while being arranged in program categories. Within each category, program names are stored in order of viewing priority (see Shigeki paragraphs 0016 and 0017). Fig. 2(a) depicts an example of a viewing priority order, with a sports program category first and a movie program category second. Figs. 2(b) and 2(c) of Shigeki depict viewing priority within a program category, *i.e.*, within the sports category, baseball programs are first, followed by soccer, and then golf. However, Shigeki does not disclose any differentiation between the sports and movie categories and no "display of a plurality of topics of a single program," such as channel number, broadcast time, and program title.

In the present invention, as recited in amended claims 1 and 20, "priority ranking related to display of a plurality of topics of a single program which are to be displayed on a screen" is separately defined for each genre. At least this feature, in combination with the other elements of the claims, is neither disclosed nor suggested by Shigeki.

Moreover, with respect, *e.g.*, to claim 3, Shigeki neither discloses, nor suggests, in combination with the other elements of the claim, "a frequency of selection by a user for each topic in each genre" is stored, and "a display priority degree is changed according to the selection frequency."

For at least the above reasons, Shigeki fails to anticipate claims 1, 3, 5, 12, 20, and 22.

Applicant also respectfully traverses the § 103(a) rejection of claim 4 over Shigeki in view of Herz. For the reasons discussed above, Shigeki does not teach all of the features of claim 1, which are incorporated in claim 4, and Herz, regardless of what else it teaches, does not supply the teachings missing from Shigeki.

Applicant also respectfully traverses the § 103(a) rejection of claims 6-9, 16, 21, and 23 over Shigeki in view of Wehmeyer. Wehmeyer discloses keyword searching. This searching, however, is performed in response to an input by a user from a keyboard (see, *e.g.*, col. 14, lines 54-67), the word input being a term the user subjectively determines indicates a characteristic of the desired program. Neither Shigeki nor Wehmeyer disclose or suggest the features of claims 6 and 21, of "automatically storing a search keyword included in supplementary information corresponding to a program watched or listened to by the user," "extracting the search keyword and displaying a program search screen image including the extracted search keyword," or "displaying a search result screen image based on a program search using a search keyword selected by a user." At least for this reason, the combination of Shigeki and Wehmeyer cannot suggest all of the features of claims 6-9, 16, 21, and 23.

Adding Ryan to Shigeki and Wehmeyer also does not render obvious claim 10, and so applicant respectfully traverses the § 103(a) rejection of this claim. Ryan discloses correlating an input search keyword with a browsed web page, and storing it for use during subsequent keyword entries for page searches. In contrast, as recited in

claim 10, a search keyword is extracted from a program viewed or listened to by a user and stored for displaying to the user.

Applicant also traverses the § 103(a0 rejection of claim 11. Adding Watanabe to Shigeki and Wehmeyer does not render obvious claim 11, at least because Watanabe does not provide the features of the independent and intervening claims absent from the other references.

With respect to the § 103(a) rejection of claims 13-15 and 17-18, adding Shiga does not provide the teachings of the independent claims missing from the other references.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the claims are patentable over the cited references. Entry of this amendment is proper after final rejection in order to place the case in condition for allowance, or because it narrows the issues on appeal. Applicant therefore requests entry of this Amendment, reconsideration of, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: December 16, 2004

By: _____
James W. Edmondson
Reg. No. 33,871